

The Corkscrew Effect

John P. Ralston

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66044

Pankaj Jain

Physics Department, I. I. T., Kanpur, India 208016

Borge Nodland

Rochester Theory Center for Optical Science and Engineering, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627

(Submitted to Physical Review Letters (1997))

We discuss a new mechanism which could cause a rotation of polarization of electromagnetic waves due to magnetic fields on cosmological scales. The effect is due to the geometrical phase of Pancharatnam and Berry, and causes a corkscrew twisting of the plane of polarization. The new effect represents an additional tool that allows possible intergalactic and cosmological magnetic fields to be studied using radio propagation.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Es, 41.20.Jb

Many studies have been done to find a cosmological component to magnetic fields. A common method looks for systematic dependence of the Faraday rotation measures (RM) with increasing redshift z . For a radio wave of wavelength λ and polarization angle ϑ , Faraday rotation [1] predicts $\vartheta = \text{RM}\lambda^2 + \chi$, where $\text{RM} = [e^3/(16\pi^3 m_e \epsilon_0 c^3)] \int^z B_z n_e dz$ for propagation through a magnetic field with component B_z along the propagation path; n_e is the electron number density of the plasma, and χ is the angle of emission.

Observation of the Faraday effect measures integrated magnetic plasma parameters along the line of sight. Although extremely stringent bounds have occasionally been stated [2], the methodology has its limitations, inasmuch as reversal of the magnetic field will reverse the rotation measure. This is not always discussed. When possible magnetic field reversals are taken into account, the observed rotation measures are not capable of bounding local magnitudes of the fields: magnetic fields larger than some bounds could well exist if the fields go through some reversals of sign along the way.

Rotation of the plane of polarization is usually attributed to birefringence. Here, we present a new physical phenomenon, which we call the ‘‘corkscrew effect,’’ which could also create a rotation of polarization. The underlying observation is that any phase shift of the positive relative to the negative helicity amplitudes of the wave will rotate a linear polarization. The corkscrew effect occurs for propagation with angular frequency ω in an electromagnetic wave equation of the form

$$[k^2 \delta_{ij} - k_i k_j - \omega^2 \epsilon_{ij}(\omega)] E_j = 0; \quad \epsilon_{ij}(\omega) = \epsilon_{ij}^S(\omega) + i \epsilon_{ij}^A(\omega), \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon^S(\omega)$ is real and symmetric, and $\epsilon^A(\omega)$ is non-zero, real and antisymmetric; the full dielectric constant is $\epsilon(\omega)$ Hermitian (no absorption) [3]. We are interested in circumstances where the propagating transverse modes are very nearly degenerate (free space $\epsilon_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$ in our units), with small perturbations lifting the degeneracy. The system then becomes a two-state evolution problem, analogous to two-state mixing problems encountered in quantum mechanics, with $\epsilon(\omega)$ with ϵ representing parameters that can vary slowly along the path of propagation. Where slow parameter variations are an issue, naive inferences about wave propagation can be wrong. For example, if $k_1(z)$ and $k_2(z)$ are the wave numbers from diagonalizing the dispersion relation for fixed parameters and fixed ω , one does generally not find the phase of a wave from the expected eikonal factors $\int^z i\{k_1(z), k_2(z)\} dz$. This is due to the geometric phase phenomenon from parallel transport in the adiabatic limit, as described for visible-light optics by Pancharatnam and Berry [4]. We focus here on this purely geometrical effect, noting for later study that strong dynamical effects can also occur – such as seen in resonant magnetic moment transitions, or resonant neutrino oscillations – but in this case resonances between coupled radio waves traveling in a tenuous medium. Interestingly, we find that sudden resonant transitions do nothing observable, while partially resonant transitions and the adiabatic limit produce very interesting results indeed.

Application of electrodynamics to a magnetized neutral plasma (with an external magnetic field $\vec{B} = B\hat{B}$) gives $\epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon_p \delta_{ij} - i\omega_B \epsilon_{ijk} \hat{B}_k (\partial \epsilon_p / \partial \omega)$, with $\epsilon_p = 1 - \omega_p^2 / \omega^2$, where ω_p is the plasma frequency, given approximately by $\omega_p^2 = 4\pi e^2 n_e / m_e$, and ω_B is the cyclotron frequency $\omega_B = eB/m_e$. Small corrections of order kT/m_e for a non-relativistic hot magnetized plasma [3] have no effect on the discussion. A common method of solution [1] assumes that the magnetic field and the wave vector are parallel. One readily diagonalizes the dielectric tensor for this case, which

has transverse eigenstates of circular polarization $\vec{E}_\pm$ and wavenumbers k_+ and k_- for the same ω . It is tempting to focus on the part of $\vec{B}$ parallel to $\vec{k}$, while treating other components ($\vec{B}_\perp$) as a perturbation. Then, goes the usual (but faulty) argument, the total rotation of polarization when the parameters vary along the line of propagation would be given by integrating $(1/2)(k_+ - k_-)$ along the path, resulting in the astronomers' rule $\Delta\theta = \text{RM}\lambda^2$ for $\omega \gg \omega_p, \omega_B$ [1]. This seems rigorous enough in astrophysical circumstances, where $\omega \approx 10\text{MHz} - 1\text{GHz}$, $n_e \approx 10^{-6}\text{cm}^{-3} - 10^{-3}\text{cm}^{-3}$, and $B \approx 10^{-9}\text{G} - 10^{-5}\text{G}$, and the approximation $\omega \gg \omega_B, \omega_p$ is satisfied by several orders of magnitude.

Our point of departure comes from noting that the propagation problem for $\vec{B} = 0$ is utterly degenerate, creating conditions for a corkscrew effect: the direction of $\vec{B}$ lifts the degeneracy and selects unique eigenstates. Treating the transverse parts of $\vec{B}$ as a perturbation will not do, because the effects of the perturbation are the same order as the splitting of eigenvalues. We solved the problem exactly for the two transverse eigenstates of $D_i = \varepsilon_{ij}E_j$ used in the adiabatic limit. One needs the eigenvalues of the inverse dielectric tensor in the 2×2 subspace orthogonal to $\vec{k}$, which are given by $\varepsilon_\pm^{-1} = \frac{\varepsilon_p}{\varepsilon_p^2 - b^2} - \frac{b^2 \sin^2 \vartheta_{kB}}{2\varepsilon_p(\varepsilon_p^2 - b^2)} \pm \frac{b\sqrt{\cos^2 \vartheta_{kB} + b^2 \sin^4 \vartheta_{kB}}}{2\varepsilon_p(\varepsilon_p^2 - b^2)}$. The magnetic field direction has been represented by polar coordinates $(\vartheta_{kB}, \phi_{kB})$ in the coordinate system where $\vec{k}$ is along the z axis; $b = \omega_p^2 \omega_B / \omega^3 \ll 1$ is a dimensionless small parameter measuring the strength of the B field. For finite b , the system is non-degenerate for any direction of $\vec{B}$. As $\cos(\vartheta_{kB}) \rightarrow 0$, the splitting of the eigenvalues reaches a non-zero minimum, exhibiting an avoided level crossing.

The exact solution also reveals that the polarization eigenvectors deviate strongly from circular polarization when $\vec{k}$ and $\vec{B}$ are nearly perpendicular, or, more precisely, when $\cos \vartheta_{kB}$ is of order b . A standard way to express the polarization of a radiation eigenvector uses the Poincaré sphere [1]. In the helicity basis, any normalized complex two-vector $|s\rangle$ can be associated with a 2×2 traceless, determinant -1 , Hermitian matrix P , which satisfies $P|s\rangle = |s\rangle$. If we write

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \vartheta_p & \sin \vartheta_p e^{-i\phi_p} \\ \sin \vartheta_p e^{i\phi_p} & -\cos \vartheta_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

then the angles (ϑ_p, ϕ_p) define the polarization state of the vector. The positive and negative circular polarizations are represented by the top and bottom poles of the sphere; linear polarizations are represented by points on the equator. The solution for the eigenstate of definite frequency d_1 is found to be

$$\tan(\vartheta_p) = b \sin^2(\vartheta_{kB}) / \cos(\vartheta_{kB}); \quad \phi_p = -2\phi_{kB}, \quad (3)$$

with d_2 following from orthogonality. To understand the physical effects, from (3), we see that the eigenvectors “follow” the magnetic field, but in a highly non-linear fashion. For $b \ll 1$, and $|\cos(\vartheta_{kB})|$ not too small, the eigenvectors are nearly circularly polarized, living on tiny circles with $\phi_p = -2\phi_{kB}$ near the top or bottom of the Poincaré sphere. (The double-valuedness of this map is a reflection of the projective character of polarization).

Something very dramatic happens when $\vec{B}$ rotates transverse to $\vec{k}$. The dominance of circular polarization is upset, even for non-zero b arbitrarily small, as the components of $\vec{B}$ transverse to $\vec{k}$ receive all the responsibility for lifting the degeneracy. The position on the Poincaré sphere jumps from its azimuthal position near the pole to the equator just as B_z crosses zero. This will occur in any circumstance (see Fig. 1) when the sign of the component of the magnetic field in the z -direction changes (a “ B_z reversal”).

It is convenient to consider the case where the magnetic field direction traverses a closed orbit along the path. We present the cases shown in Fig. 1(a), where the $\vec{B}$ rotates in a spiral about $\vec{k}$ without reversing, compared to another case [Fig. 1(b)] where B_z reverses while undergoing an azimuthal twist. The corresponding trajectories of the polarization on the Poincaré sphere are also shown. Although the system parameters return to their initial configuration after the cycle, the eigenstates pick up a geometrical phase, with magnitude on the positive (E_+) eigenvector given by the solid angle Ω traversed on the Poincaré sphere. The phase on the negative (E_-) eigenvector is easily shown to be the same with opposite sign, so that the phase difference of the two circular polarizations is twice the solid angle swept out. This phase difference, which is just the angle by which the plane of polarization is rotated, is entirely of geometrical origin, and is in addition to the eikonal phase $\exp[i \int^z k_j(z) dz]$.

The geometrical character of the process can be intuitively visualized by considering the effects on a two-dimensional Cartesian coordinate frame (representing the set of polarizations) erected tangent to the sphere. As the coordinate frame is dragged along parallel to itself, its orientation accumulates information on the curvature of the state space. For the no B_z reversal case [the spiral field of Fig. 1(a)], the solid angle Ω is of order b^2 . A phase shift of order b^2 would be quite small, and give a rotation of polarization going like λ^6 . On the other hand, suppose the field B_z reverses, dragging the tangent frame from top to bottom of the sphere. At the bottom, the frame (oriented at the angle ϕ_p) undergoes a twist by the azimuthal angle $-2\Delta\phi_{kB}$, then B_z reverses again, followed by $+2\Delta\phi_{kB}$. The net

phase shift is $\Omega = 4\Delta\phi_{kB}$. The ϕ_B dependence of ϕ_p is crucial. Of course it is not necessary for b to be constant with z . Nor is a closed circuit necessary. When the slow parameters p^k vary arbitrarily, the corkscrew effect gives a rotation of polarization by an angle $\phi = 2 \int^{p(z)} dp^k \cdot A_p^k(z)$, which is of order unity and which is determined solely by changes of directions of $\vec{B}$. Here $A_p^k = (1 - \cos\vartheta_p)\partial^k\phi_p$, where ∂^k is the derivative with respect to the parameters $[b(z), \cos\vartheta_{kB}(z), \phi_{kB}(z)]$, or, more directly, (ϑ_p, ϕ_p) . (In Berry's convention [4], the phases are already attached to eigenstates.) If there is more than one B_z reversal along the trajectory, the various contributions track the history of the polarization states along the trajectory.

Borrowing quantum terminology, we have just examined the adiabatic approach to resonance where a phase shift of geometrical origin occurs. Under adiabatic conditions, the “probability” (amplitude squared) of each eigenstate is conserved, while the phase-physics is non-trivial. The adiabatic approximation applies when $p^{-1}(z)dp(z)/dz \ll kb$. This means that parameters vary over a length L such that $\omega_p^2\omega_B L/\omega^2 > 1$, that is, that the wavelength is not too short. Comparing the scales, this is also the circumstances where Faraday rotation is non-negligible. Numerous interesting phenomena also occur outside of the adiabatic limit. In non-adiabatic resonance transitions the probability can hop from one state to another, again generating non-trivial dynamical phases. In the extreme case of the “sudden” approximation the parameters vary so rapidly (on the distance scale of the wavelength splitting) that the system jumps abruptly from old eigenstates to new eigenstates based only on the overlap (dot-product) of the states. For the magnetized plasma, this is the limit of $\omega \rightarrow \infty$. With b (the dimensionless level splitting parameter) going like $1/\omega^3$, the splitting becomes so small that any physical variation of parameters becomes “sudden.” Transitions occur on the basis of maximum overlap, and when the eigenstates switch, the probability switches correspondingly. This answers the paradox that the $\vec{B}$ -field actually does lift the degeneracy of a gamma ray, but with negligible results: the corkscrew effect, to be sizable, occurs when the ordinary Faraday rotation is sizable. One cannot avoid the conclusion that under a wide variety of circumstances, a B_z -reversal will produce non-trivial phase shifts between the helicity states and a substantial frequency-independent rotation of polarization.

Let us now turn to astrophysical implications of these results. Current knowledge of intergalactic magnetic fields is scanty. Even the basic origin of established galactic fields is unknown. There are two major theories invoking internal dynamos or pre-existing primordial magnetic fields [5]. Indications of a coherent field coming from excess RM's of extragalactic sources has been claimed, but the interpretation of the RM data is ambiguous [6]. The existence of magnetic fields in galaxies at large redshifts has been argued to be a challenge to galaxy dynamo theory [7].

Recently, an indication of anisotropy in the propagation of radio waves on cosmological distances was reported [8]. After the Faraday effect was subtracted, a signed difference of angles called β was observed to behave as $\beta = r/2\Lambda_s \cos(\gamma)$ [In the analysis of [8], care was used to employ a variable (β) which properly reflects the projective nature of polarization observables. Combinations such as $\chi - \psi$, $|\chi - \psi|$, and the acute angle between χ and ψ cannot serve to detect cosmological birefringence.] Surprisingly, the direction of the anisotropy axis extracted in [8] coincides within errors with the direction of the dipole component of the cosmic microwave background [9], perhaps indicating that some type of intergalactic or cosmological medium may be at work. The possibility of systematic bias in the data was discussed, with emphasis on corrections made by the observers for our own galaxy. Studying the internal structure of the data, it was noticed [8] that strong correlations were observed for about half the data for galaxies with $z \geq 0.3$, while no significant correlation was observed for the half of the data with $z < 0.2 - 0.3$. If something not taken into account were due to our own galaxy, it should affect all data for the extragalactic sources in the same way. As reported in [8], unexpected physics including the corkscrew effect that might occur in our local neighborhood cannot account for the observations.

Whether a magnetic field of cosmological extent could explain the same correlation is a very interesting question. The turning-on of the correlation for $z > 0.3$ may be an indication that a system enormously larger than our local group trails a magnetic field or some other condensate of huge size. Galaxy density distribution studies tend to support the presence of coherent structure over vast scales, although this is controversial [10]. Complementary information might come from measurements of the cosmic microwave background polarization affected by primordial magnetic fields existing long before galaxy formation [11]. Moreover, there could be a wide range of interpretations for the results of [8], including anisotropic cosmologies of general relativity, an axion-like condensate domain wall, universal rotation, spontaneous rotational symmetry breaking, or antisymmetric degrees of freedom in gravitational theory [12]. We cannot begin to answer all the questions here. A systematic approach using all the tools available, and orders of magnitude more data, would be able to make a significant scientific contribution.

While focusing here on the parameters affecting linear polarization, there is clearly a scientific gold mine in the accumulation of all radio polarization observables which have never been interpreted taking into account the effects we discuss. It is very important to have data at different frequencies, in order to exploit the full potential of observations. The corkscrew effect might serve as a valuable discovery tool when larger data sets become available, with many

sources examined over a range of radio frequencies, supplemented by optical and ultraviolet polarization data.

Doug McKay made a helpful suggestion. PJ thanks the High Energy Group of ICTP (Trieste) for hospitality during completion of this work under the Associate Membership Programme. DOE Grant DE-FG02-85ER40214, the K*STAR program under the Kansas Institute for Theoretical and Computational Science, Grant DAE/PHY/96152, and NSF Grant PHY94-15583 provided support.

-
- [1] See textbooks on radio astronomy, eg. K. Rohlfs and T. L. Wilson, *Tools of Radio Astronomy*, 2nd Edition (Springer Verlag, 1996).
 - [2] M. Reinhardt, *Astron. and Astrophys.* **19**, 104 (1972); J. P. Vallee and P. Kronberg, *Astr. Ap.* **43**, 233 (1975); V. S. Kolobov, M. Reinhardt, and V. N. Sazonov, *Astrophys. J. Letters* **17**, 183 (1976); K. Kuznetsova, *Sov. Astron.* **20**, 269 (1976); A. A. Ruzmaikin and D. D. Sokoloff, *Astrophys. J.* **360**, 1 (1990).
 - [3] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, and L.P. Piatevskii, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, 2nd Edition (Pergamon Press 1984); F. Low, *Classical Field Theory*, (Wiley, NY 1997); J. R. Meyer-Arendt, *Introduction to Classical and Modern Optics*, 4th Edition, (Springer, 1995).
 - [4] S. Pancharatnam, *Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci. A*, **44**, 247 (1955); M. Berry, *J. Mod. Opt.* **34**, 1401 (1987) and in *Fundamental Aspects of Quantum Theory*, NATO ASI Series Vol 144, edited by V. Gorini and A. Frigerio (Plenum, New York) p. 267.
 - [5] See, e.g. Ya. B. Zeldovich, A. A. Ruzmaikin and D. D. Sokoloff, *Magnetic Fields in Astrophysics* (Gordon and Breach, 1983). A useful review is E. Zweibel, *Nature* **385**, 131 (1995).
 - [6] Y. Sofue, M. Fujimoto and K. Kawabata, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Japan* **20**, 125 (1968); K. Kawabata, M. Fujimoto, Y. Sofue and M. Fukui, *ibid* **293**, (1969); M. Reinhardt and M. Thiel, *Astrophys. Lett.* **7** 101 (1970); H. Arp, *Nature* **232**, 463 (1971) and *Phys. Lett.* **A129**, 135 (1988); K.-T. Kim, P. C. Tribble and P. P. Kronberg, *Astrophys. J.* **379**, 80 (1991).
 - [7] R. M. Kulsrud, *et al. Astrophys. J.* (submitted); R. Beck *et al. Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **34**, 155 (1996).
 - [8] Borge Nodland and John P. Ralston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3043 (1997).
 - [9] R. W. Kühne, private communication, and preprint submitted to *Phys. Rev. Lett.*; R. Bracewell and V. Eshleman, preprint aps1997jun13_006 (1997).
 - [10] T. Lauer and M. Postman, *Astrophys. J.* **425**, 418 (1995); A. G. Riess, W. H. Press and R. P. Kirschner, *ibid* **438**, L17 (1995); *ibid* 445, L91 (1995); R. Watkins and H. A. Feldman, *ibid* **430** L17 (1994); **453** L73 (1995).
 - [11] M. Rees, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **153**, L1 (1968); C. Ceccarelli et al., in Proc. 17th Rencontre de Moriond, (Editions Frontiers, Gif- sur Yvette 1982); E. Milaneschi and R. Fabbri, *Astron. and Astrophys.* **151**, 7 (1985); A. Kosowsky and A. Loeb, *Astrophys. J.* **469**, 1 (1996).
 - [12] C. H. Brans, *Astrophys. J.* **197**, 1 (1975); R. A. Matzner and B. W. Tolman, *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 2951 (1982); M. Sachs, *General Relativity and Matter* (Reidel, 1982); R. B. Mann and J. W. Moffat, *Can. J. Phys.* **59** 1730 (1981); C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 369 (1989); R. B. Mann, J. W. Moffat, and J. H. Palmer, *ibid* **62**, 2765 (1989); D. V. Ahluwalia and T. Goldman, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A28**, 2623 (1993); Y. N. Obukhov, V. A. Korotky and F. W. Hehl, preprint astro-ph/9705243; A. Dobado and A. L. Maroto, preprint astro-ph/9706044.

FIG. 1. Cartoons illustrating a phase change from slow variations in the direction of $\vec{B}$ along the path of the wave. (a) $\vec{B}$ varies in a spiral, producing a tiny circular orbit on the Poincaré sphere; (b) B_z reverses while B_ϕ twists, producing a flip and twist on the sphere. Corresponding points (1–5), with the configurations at 5 equal to 1, are shown.

This figure "fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9707326v2>